

**Remarks**

Claims 1-44 were pending in the application. Claims 21, 40 and 42 have been canceled. Claims 45 and 46 have been added hereby. Therefore, claims 1-20, 22-39, 41, and 43-46 are pending in the application.

The drawings were objected to because the cross-sectional views of the drawings do not show cross-sectional view of appropriate materials.

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5).

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the invention as recited in the claims.

Claims 21, 22, 30, and 36 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 32 is objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(d).

Claims 40 and 43-44 are each objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75 as being substantially a duplicate of another claim.

Claims 18, 37, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 18, 37, and 42 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 18-15, 19, 25, 26, 29, 31-34, and 38-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,675,680 issued to Ames et al. on October 7, 1997.

Claims 3, 5-7, 16, 17, 20, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ames et al. in view of United States Patent No. 6,595,698 issued to Gutierrez et al. on July 22, 2003.

Claims 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ames et al. in view of United States Patent No. 6,478,606 issued to McNerney et al. on November 12, 2002.

Each of the various rejections and objections are overcome by amendments that are made to the specification, drawing, and/or claims, as well as, or in the alternative, by various arguments that are presented.

Any amendments to any claim for reasons other than as expressly recited herein as being for the purpose of distinguishing such claim from known prior art are not being made with an intent to change in any way the literal scope of such claims or the range of equivalents for such claims. They are being made simply to present language that is better in conformance with the form requirements of Title 35 of the United States Code or is simply clearer and easier to understand than the originally presented language. Any amendments to any claim expressly made in order to distinguish such claim from known prior art are being made only with an intent to change the literal scope of such claim in the most minimal way, i.e., to just avoid the prior art in a way that leaves the claim novel and not obvious in view of the cited prior art, and no equivalent of any subject matter remaining in the claim is intended to be surrendered.

#### **Objection to the Drawing**

Amendments have been presented to the specification and drawings to overcome the objection to the drawings as follows. Replacement drawing sheets 1, 3, 4, and 5, as well as a copy of original drawing sheet 2 are attached hereto.

The drawings were objected to because the cross-sectional views of the drawings do not show cross-sectional view of appropriate materials.

The cross-sectional views have been amended to clarify the materials shown therein. More particularly, in FIG. 3, the sections that represent chuck 101 had previously been mislabeled 103, which corresponded to the hexagonal hole in chuck 101. This has been corrected in the replacement sheet drawings. Furthermore, it is noted that the material for chuck 101 has not been specified in a limiting fashion, although it has been stated in the description that chuck 101 may typically be metal or plastic. Thus, the cross-hatching in the amended FIG. 3 is appropriate.

The confusing stippling in FIGs. 7, 8, 9, 10 and 12 has been removed.

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) because reference sign "1351" is not mentioned in the description.

Incorrect reference sign “1351” has been replaced with the correct reference sign 1353, which is mentioned in the description.

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the invention as recited in the claims. More specifically, the Office Action states that the feature of at least one of the fibers being not coplanar with the terminating ends of the subset of the fibers must be shown or the feature canceled from the claims.

FIG. 13 has been amended to show this feature. FIG. 13 has also been amended to show additional fibers, as well as to correct the inadvertent error of one of elements 1353 not reaching further array 1357.

**Objection Under 37 C.F.R. 1.75**

Claim 32 is objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(d). The Office Action states that the present specification does not explain removing the chuck. More specifically it is not clear how the ferrules are held together if the chuck is removed since the chuck is what holds the ferrules together.

This objection is respectfully traversed.

The specification clearly states on page 11, lines 16-18, “that although chuck has been shown remaining as part of the final array, even when the ferrules are bonded to each other through the use of glue. However, if the ferrules are bonded together, thereafter the chuck may be removed.” To paraphrase, once the ferrules are glued to each other, the chuck is no longer needed, and can be removed, since the ferrules will remain in place because of the glue between them.

Claims 40 and 43-44 are each objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75 as being substantially a duplicate of another claim.

Claims 40 and 42 have been canceled.

Claims 43 and 44 are different, because in 43 the alignment element is bonded within the additional hole of the claimed apparatus, while in claim 44 the hole of the claimed apparatus is adapted to receive an alignment element from the device to which it is mated.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph**

Claims 18, 37, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 18, 37, and 42 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The Office Action states that these claims omitted an alignment member as an element, because an apparatus cannot be aligned without an alignment member. However, what has not been appreciated, is that the alignment member can be protruding from the device to be aligned with, and the alignment member is inserted as part of the mating process into the hole of the additional ferrule. These claims have been written to cover both 1) the situation where there is an alignment member in the hole of the claimed apparatus and 2) the situation when the alignment member is protruding from the device being mated to the claimed apparatus. Therefore, no element is missing from these claims and they are allowable as now presented.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 18-15, 19, 25, 26, 29, 31-34, and 38-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,675,680 issued to Ames et al. on October 7, 1997.

The rejected independent claims have been amended to include limitations such as in claims 18, 37, and 42, which were indicated to be allowable should the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph be overcome. Therefore, the amended independent claims, and their respective dependent claims, are now allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(a).

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

Claims 3, 5-7, 16, 17, 20, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ames et al. in view of United States Patent No. 6,595,698 issued to Gutierrez et al. on July 22, 2003.

Claims 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ames et al. in view of United States Patent No. 6,478,606 issued to McNerney et al. on November 12, 2002.

These grounds of rejection are predicated on the rejection of the independent claims over Ames et al. under 35 U.S.C. 102(a). Since that rejection has been avoided, as described hereinabove, and since the additional cited references do not provide the element that has been acknowledged to be missing from Ames et al., these rejections are also avoided by the amendments to the independent claims.

Therefore, applicants' claims 3, 5-7, 16, 17, 20, 27, and 28 are allowable over the cited combinations under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

#### **New Claims**

New claims 45 and 46 have been added to better define applicants' invention. . No new matter has been added. The new claims are similar to originally filed claims 19 and 20. The Office Action apparently believes that the epoxy is the non-rigid material of the claim. However, this is incorrect. When dried the epoxy or potting material would be considered a rigid material, and thus not conforming to the recited limitation. It would also not perform the function explained in the specification that is performed by the non-rigid material. Thus claim 45 is allowable over the cited prior art. So too is claim 46 which specified preferred non-rigid materials and depends from claim 45.

**Conclusion**


It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner still believes that there are unresolved issues, he is invited to call applicant's attorney so that arrangements may be made to discuss and resolve any such issues.

In the event that an extension of time is required for this amendment to be considered timely, and a petition therefor does not otherwise accompany this amendment, any necessary extension of time is hereby petitioned for, and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the appropriate cost of such petition to the **Lucent Technologies Deposit Account No. 12-2325**.

Respectfully,

N. R. Basavanhally  
C. A. Bolle  
P. R. Kolodner  
R. R. Ruel  
J. D. Weld

By   
Eugene J. Rosenthal, Attorney  
Reg. No. 36,658  
732-949-1857

Lucent Technologies Inc.

Date: 1/2/04